

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MIDLAND/ODESSA DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	§	
	§	
v.	§	MO:19-CR-170
	§	
CHRISTOPHER DOBEK	§	

ORDER TO WITHDRAW DEFENDANT’S PRO SE MOTIONS

BEFORE THE COURT are the following *pro se* motions filed by Defendant Christopher Dobek (Defendant) in the above-referenced cause:

- 1) Motion for Speedy Trial (Doc. 38);
- 2) Motion to Amend Plea Deal (Doc. 39);
- 3) Motion to Appoint New Counsel (Doc. 40);
- 4) Motion for all Discovery (Doc. 41);
- 5) Motion to Suppress any Narcotics Found on Premises (Doc. 42);
- 6) Motion to Change District of Hearing (Doc. 43);
- 7) Motion to Suppress Plea Deal Agreement (Doc. 44);
- 8) Motion to Dismiss Counsel (Doc. 45);
- 9) Motion to Delete “Knowing and Intentionally Conspire (Doc. 46);
- 10) Motion to Suppress Indictment (Doc. 47);
- 11) Motion to Smudge Indictment (Doc. 48);
- 12) Motion to Suppress any Narcotics on Premises, All Hearsay (Doc. 49);
- 13) Motion to Dismiss Charges (Doc. 50);
- 14) Motion to Suppress Statement on Indictment “Over 50 Grams of Actual Methamphetamine” (Doc. 51);

- 15) Motion to Suppress Phone Evidence (Doc. 52);
- 16) Motion to Vacate Search and Seizure (Doc. 53);
- 17) Motion to Suppress “Statement” From Confidential Informant #1 (Doc. 58);
- 18) Motion to Retest Evidence (Doc. 59);
- 19) Motion to Suppress “Statement” From Confidential Informant #2 (Doc. 61);
- 20) Motion to Suppress Search Warrant (Doc. 62);
- 21) Motion to Suppress Defendants “Statement” (Doc. 63);
- 22) Motion to Suppress All Evidence Found During, After or Connected To/With Search Warrant (Doc. 64); and
- 23) Motion to Suppress “Conspiracy” on Indictment (Doc. 65).

On December 4, 2019, the Court held a hearing on the above-referenced motions. During the hearing, the Court discussed with Defendant the prohibition on hybrid representation and explained to Defendant that he is not entitled to file motions *pro se* while he is represented by counsel. Additionally, Defendant’s counsel, Charles King, indicated that he did not endorse or adopt Defendant’s *pro se* motions. The Court also discussed with Defendant his guilty plea, plea agreement, upcoming sentencing, and Presentence Report. At the conclusion of these discussions, Defendant requested that the above-referenced motions be withdrawn. Further, Defendant expressed his willingness for attorney Charles King to continue to represent him through his sentencing. This Order serves to memorialize the rulings made on the record allowing Defendant to withdraw his *pro se* motions.

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the above-referenced motions, filed *pro se* by Defendant, are **WITHDRAWN**. (Docs. 38–53 and 58, 59, 61–65).

Accordingly, the Clerk of Court is **ORDERED** to **WITHDRAW** the above-referenced motions. (Docs. 38–53 and 58, 59, 61–65).

It is so **ORDERED**.

SIGNED this 4th day of December, 2019.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ron Griffin', is written over a horizontal line.

RONALD C. GRIFFIN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE